

## China and the Stakes In Asia

by Alfred le S. Jenkins

America has come to the fore as a world power at an especially trying and demanding time. The atomic age has arrived just when the world was beginning to find some solutions to the many problems presented to it in rapid succession by the age of steam and electricity. No one doubts that these threshold years of the atomic age through which we are passing can bring us either undreamed-of good or indescribable evil. This is the promise—and the threat—of breathtakingly rapid material progress. Whether we shall harvest the fruits of the promise or of the threat will depend upon the moral direction which humanity as a whole can give to the immense physical forces which it now possesses. This whole question is given added urgency by the highly charged situation in which a shrunken world is largely divided into two opposing camps, each possessed of the ability virtually to destroy the other.

There are many who fear that this situation can end only in mutual destruction. The Communists would appear to believe that some great holocaust is in store for mankind, inasmuch as the one recurring theme in Communist dogma is the "inevitable" fight to the finish between the Communist and capitalist worlds—despite Communist tactical protestations from time to time of peaceful intent. This seeming conviction is indeed one of the greatest dangers of communism, for it is a certainty that both men and nations tend to gravitate toward what they constantly hold before the mind's eye. I cannot believe, however, that we are inexorably moving toward some great Wagnerian catastrophe on a world scale. The universal will to live is a powerful force in God's human experiment on earth, and I cannot believe that anything as meaningful as that great experiment is destined either to explode or to fizzle out.

There is no mistaking the fact that the international problems which our country faces are many and complex, and some are exceedingly frustrating in that there does not seem to be an easy or quick solution to them. To some degree we Americans must share the guilt of all, that these problems confront our present world in the forms which they take. I believe, however, that we will be called upon to contribute to their solution in far greater measure than we may have, through sins of either commission or omission, contributed to their emergence. This is natural and right, if only because our equipment to meet them is without any doubt adequate to the challenge, provided we fully recognize and rightly use both our vast material and spiritual strength. We need to remind ourselves that our nation is in fact something new and different on the face of the earth. It is the first nation in history which at its inception was founded consciously, carefully, and prayerfully on the daring proposition that all men are created equal and which was designed to insure for each individual personal freedom and opportunity, as nearly equal and unlimited as imperfect human institutions can contrive.

I have devoted this much time to reminding ourselves both of the precarious state of our world and of the challenge which is presented to our country, because Asia's problems are peculiarly the product of these forces which have converged on the 20th century and because Asians seek precisely what we ourselves have sought and won in such gratifying measure.

Most of Asia has up to now not enjoyed much of the material, social, and political advantages which the 20th century has brought to many of the other areas of the world. It has been said that Asia for some time has had a window on the 20th century

and that it is now determined to find the door to it. This determination is as real and strong as it is natural and right. Asia will find this door, or come very near to battering down our whole structure in the attempt. The real Asian revolution of our time is aimed at very nearly the same things which we ourselves respect as man's highest values: freedom of each individual to walk upright in the dignity of his God-given manhood, the provision of material necessities and some comforts for all, and a sense of "belonging" to a group of which he can be proud. The great tragedy is that the world Communist conspiracy has with some success attempted to ride the crest of this largely readymade, truly Asian revolution, diverting it from its natural course and denying to those who have been victimized most of the things which they seek. And the irony of it is that it is the free world which has developed the institutions and the experience which can best produce those very things.

#### **Asia's Stake in Asia**

Our stake in Asia, while it includes our material and other investments there, has far broader meaning also. In the closely interdependent world of today everyone has a stake in what happens in Asia, and for no lesser reason than concern lest our whole human experiment on this little globe may end in an explosion rather than continue without major interruption on its evolutionary way. We, of all people, should be able to understand Asian aspirations. And we must never for one moment forget the obvious fact that it is the Asians themselves who have the greatest stake of all in Asia. It is only by holding to this truth that our own interests there will be served in the long run. The extent of Communist objectives is easily discerned: the Communists will go just as far as free men will let them. If we have learned anything in Asia in the past few years it should be the lesson that it is largely up to the threatened Asians to stop communism in Asia—with fraternal support from other free peoples where it is wanted and where it will be effective. We must, of course, in the last analysis reserve freedom of action in any area open to us when we believe our own security interests to be threatened. But the problem is a mutual one and will be solved satisfactorily only in willing and understanding concert. We sincerely believe that our stake in Asia

is in no way incompatible with Asia's own stake in Asia, and I shall speak of it in this sense.

Our stake in Asia is in fact now gravely endangered partly because for so long we and most of the West were scarcely aware that we had very high stakes there. Asian questions are the most controversial because they are perhaps the least understood. The Soviet Union, however, partly because of the dictates of geography, has always had to keep an eye on Asia. It seems to have recognized quite early those tremendous forces in Asia which are revolutionary and to have seen its opportunity to capture those forces for the sinister purposes of Russian imperialism, using as vehicle and guise the mechanism of the so-called world socialist revolution powered by the Kremlin and the Communist Party. This was made easier after World War II not only because of the increased economic misery and social ferment resulting from protracted warfare and the tremendous difficulties faced by those nations which had recently won independence, but also because of the widespread and deep resentment of previous forms of Western exploitation in the area.

The indeniable fact that Western activities in Asia also brought much that was good did little to sooth injured Asian sensibilities. It is human nature that help to the weak may be resented almost as much as harm, and in some subtle ways perhaps even more. Any man worthy of the name wants to stand squarely on his own two feet and compete in industry, science, and education, rather than accept a donation and feel obliged to the donor. This is a problem which we frankly have to face in our aid programs to free peoples who want to preserve their freedom. Our intentions are good, and the need may be great—in the interest of the recipient and in our own enlightened self-interest—but the emphasis must be on fraternal help to stand up straight until we can look each other in the eye at the same level and proceed with the proper business of mutual contribution to progress.

Communism is eager to promise what Asia wants: economic plenty and even individual and national dignity. It is not too difficult to sell these false promises to people who are to a considerable extent politically inattentive. The surprising and heartening thing is that under the circumstances communism has not made more progress than it has in postwar Asia.

Our central problem in Asia is the coming to

power of a fanatically hostile Chinese Communist regime in close partnership with the U. S. S. R., to all appearances charged by world communism with special responsibilities for Communist enslavement of the rest of Asia. In addition to the manpower of China and its material resources, largely potential, communism wants to control the industrial capacity of Japan and the food and mineral resources of Southeast Asia.

#### **Communist Success In China**

A great deal has been said about the reasons for the Communist success in China, and much of this has been highly charged with emotion. This is understandable. I confess to feeling very deep emotion myself about any development which affects our national interest so greatly and which affects the lives of 600 million human beings even more immediately. But it is important to remember that one of the chief causes, if not the chief cause, of the Communist triumph in China is that the Communists successfully hoodwinked a large proportion of the Chinese people into believing that they could provide what the Chinese wanted. For countless millions this was their own plot of land; for hundreds of thousands of others, including the intelligentsia, it was enhanced national prestige. Private business was promised a relatively long life and an easy and promising transition to socialism. The workers were assured that eventually they would inherit the whole and be the masters. All of this was made even more attractive by the familiar, spurious, and always short-lived Communist device of the "United Front," by which the Communist Party purports initially to cooperate with non-Communist parties and institutions until the growth of police state controls makes this sham unnecessary.

This program, to the uninitiated Chinese, was enticing—as it appears on surface examination to many others in predominantly agrarian Asia. Communism was also portrayed as the "inevitable wave of the future" and as the newest and most progressive of all ideologies. "New" and "progressive" are particularly appealing terms to people who have comparatively recently and with agonizing embarrassment been forced to view some important elements in their civilization as "outmoded" and "lagging."

We know not only that communism is actually "old hat" but also that it has been tried and found

wanting in practically all respects, and particularly in those respects most essential to man's happiness and well-being. We know that Communists, conversely, in speaking of our free systems as "old," "outmoded," and "discredited," are harking back several decades to the growing pains and admitted dislocations and injustices which marked the emergence of industrial capitalism in the period of the Industrial Revolution; and that they are depicting even this adolescent age of capitalism with wild exaggeration. We know that democracy and planned capitalism have solved these problems to an amazingly successful extent, while preserving individual liberties and the drive, virility, and ever renewed newness which free thought and essentially free enterprise and competition alone can produce—and which communism can never achieve by its very nature. We know, indeed, that theoretical communism has proved unworkable largely because it is blind to the basic nature of humankind; that when it is tried it evolves, despite itself, into a tyrannical, bureaucratic dictatorship with privilege for the few and the most clearly stratified society imaginable.

Many Asians know none of these things, or are not convinced of them. We are trying our best to help them know the truth. I say we are trying our best; I hope we are. We estimate that the Communists are spending at least ten times as much money on their propaganda campaigns as we are in the informational aspects of our "campaign of truth." We may perhaps take some comfort from the belief that the truth, at least where it can be seen plainly, may be more cheaply and successfully marketed than even cleverly packaged falsehood.

#### **Disillusionment With Communism**

Fortunately there are holes in the Iron Curtain. The truth can be seen fairly plainly in parts of Germany, and as a result 1,800,000 refugees in 5 years have chosen truth and freedom at great personal sacrifice. The truth is more clearly emerging to the Vietnamese; nearly a half million refugees have already chosen to forsake Ho Chi-minh's "paradise," taking with them what few belongings they could. In divided Korea the truth is not hard to discern, and the overwhelming majority, not only of North Korean but of Chinese prisoners of war as well, responded to the pull of

truth by forsaking ties of home and family and electing to join forces with the truth. The Chinese and North Koreans now know communism intimately, and most of them appear to want no more of it. The Communists' ill-fated Korean adventure ironically but logically established two principles which may yet prove to be their own undoing: the principle of determined collective security through the United Nations and the principle of non-forcible repatriation. The two million Chinese in British Hong Kong are close enough to stark realities to know the truth—and in Hong Kong each and every succeeding year since the Communist takeover of the mainland fewer Chinese Communist flags and more Chinese Nationalist flags have been displayed on the respective national holidays.

The gains which communism ~~may~~ achieve through its mammoth propaganda campaign can be more than offset under circumstances where communism in action can be clearly seen. An iron curtain is literally the shield of communism and the badge of basic failure and fear. The Communists want to sustain vital materials through barter, but they fear above all things an exchange of ideas and accurate knowledge.

For those behind the Iron Curtain knowledge has come too late to save them, at least for a while. The Chinese, among the other victims, have learned the hard way. The peasant who was promised land first actually received it, but many have already been dispossessed by the process of state collectivization; and the others, already suffering from Communist requisition of the fruits of their toil, now see the same fate in store for them. Resistance there has surely been, but the Communists have been careful to vary the pressure for collectivization in order to restrict resistance to proportions which will be manageable for their increasingly efficient police state methods.

Perhaps the greatest of communism's failures has been with regard to food production. The march of forced collectivization has invariably left both bloodshed and famine in its wake, and further misery is surely in store for a China whose marginal subsistence level has always been precarious. At times when natural disaster is added, suffering is incalculably compounded. In the past other countries have rushed to China's aid at such times. During the recent unprecedented floods, however, while China was continuing to ship vast quantities of foodstuffs to the Soviet

Union in payment for industrial and military aid, China twice rejected offers of help from the League of Red Cross Societies. And at the same time Communist China's own radios were callously recording the magnitude of suffering visited on its people, in large measure due to the false pride of a boasting regime.

#### Inhuman Treatment In Red China

As for other characteristics of the Red Chinese regime, everyone has read reports of the countless killings and induced suicides in connection with the so-called reform of agriculture, business, labor, education, and religion; of the turning of children against parents and of friend against friend; of mass and individual "brain-washing"; of forced labor camps; of the "People's Courts" where "justice" is made the shameless handmaiden of politics; and of the inexcusable treatment which our own businessmen and missionaries and, in the early days, our officials have received from the Chinese Communists. There are still 28 American civilians languishing in Chinese Communist jails under intolerable physical conditions, all but incommunicado, many of them without trial or even a statement of charges against them. The recent sentencing of 13 Americans on "espionage" charges is but the latest shocking chapter in the Communist mistreatment of foreign nationals, and evidence of their utter disregard for commitments which they assumed under the Korean Armistice Agreement on prisoners of war.

Even better known and documented is the external conduct of Red China, which includes overt aggression in Korea and the related defiance and contempt shown for the United Nations, in which the regime claims a seat "by right"; semicovert but very substantial aggression against Indochina; forcible occupation of Tibet; subversion and intimidation throughout Southeast Asia; unspeakable atrocities against prisoners of war; conducting an extortion racket among overseas Chinese, using relatives on the mainland as hostages, and sponsorship of a huge trade in banned narcotics in order to gain badly needed foreign exchange.

Is there no good that can be said of the regime? There is a little. The streets are reported to be cleaner, and there have been spotty advances in public health. On the other hand there appears to be a rise in tuberculosis, especially among over-worked cadre and industrial workers, and an in-

creasing incidence of nervous breakdowns and other mental troubles, maladies with which China had amazingly little experience before the Communists came. There have, it is true, been some advances in industrial recovery and in new industrial enterprises. Such advances have for the most part been inefficient and wasteful of human energy and life, but these factors seem to be of minor concern to the regime, which is bent upon building a heavy-industry base. Communist China's 5-year program, however, is seriously behind schedule. The Communists lack trained technical and managerial personnel, and there are indications that the Chinese are not as impressed as their propaganda would have one believe with their results in emulating "advanced Soviet methods."

#### **Tremendous Energy in "New China"**

It would be a mistake to assume, however, that there is not tremendous force behind the so-called "New China." Most of this force derives from the energy of the true Asian revolution, which in China has been captured and imperfectly but dangerously harnessed by communism—but force is there. In a few areas, and at ghastly cost in others, communism itself has been able to supply in limited and usually warped form a few of the things which the Chinese sought and needed. Communism has succeeded to some extent in flattering youth and women by giving them difficult and important jobs to do. Insofar as communism with its demands and challenges resembles a religion, albeit a perverted and materialistic one, it has helped fill the uncomfortable vacuum left by the earlier breakdown of the ancient Confucian morality and of the closely knit, authoritarian family. Last but not least, the Chinese Communist regime, while it has certainly not brought to the Chinese a national dignity by its lawless acts, has managed to get very much into the lime-light and with Soviet help has achieved a military potential of menacing proportions. Although Communist China was at the Geneva Conference largely because it was the chief instigator of the troubles which the Conference itself was designed to settle, its presence there inescapably gave it added "prestige." Even those Chinese who in their hearts oppose the regime must derive some satisfaction from this "prestige," even though they may have vastly preferred that it be attained by more honorable means.

China and the Soviet Union are losing no time in attempting to capitalize on the Mao regime's growing prominence, in an attempt to gain its international acceptance, through wider diplomatic recognition and a seat in the United Nations. The current Communist tactic of a "peace offensive" is admirably suited to the need quickly to garb the Mao regime in respectability. The Sino-Soviet agreements of October 12, 1954, seem especially to be designed further to increase Communist China's prestige and at the same time to give at least the surface appearance that Communist nations can deal with each other on the basis of equality and reciprocity. We have all along considered the Red Chinese regime as a willing accomplice of the Soviets and, as such, a sort of junior partner rather than a full-fledged satellite in the Eastern European sense. These agreements strengthen this view and at least on the surface appear to create a kind of Moscow-Beijing axis within the Communist orbit, in further contrast to Moscow's relations with its Eastern European satellites. This surface "government to government" camaraderie, however, does not necessarily alter the sub-surface unified Communist Party control of both governments.

We have learned to be wary of frenzied Communist protestations of peaceful intent such as are now issuing forth with stereotyped consistency from all Communist capitals. I doubt that under present conditions of the world the Communists want a big war. But experience has shown that they are never averse to small wars if they think their ends can be gained thereby. The trouble is that we may not always succeed in preventing small wars from growing. Communists consider that in a very real sense they are always at war with the non-Communist world and that periods of cease-fire are but a tactic of expediency in a continuing war. Peace is but the other side of the war coin. George Orwell may prove to be one of the most perspicacious writers of our time.

The Communists need a "breather" now, and they will doubtless get it. The free world is not going to start a war. For that reason they can get a "breather" any time they want it and for a duration of precisely their own determining. This is a great advantage for them, but I see no sensible way out of it. At the same time, so long as the Communists are the self-proclaimed mortal enemy of all who are not in their camp (in their eyes, and by their own admission, they recognize

no "neutrals"), I can see no rhyme nor reason whatsoever in helping them to solve their great internal difficulties, in helping them to make the most of these breathing spells which they can always have. A "peace offensive" for their purposes is in large measure a bid for trade—especially trade in strategic materials in which they are short—and in this instance also a bid for full free world acceptance of Communist China into the family of nations.

#### Question of Recognition

We do not recognize the regime of Mao Tse-tung as representing the will of the masses of Chinese people, for whom we continue to have the deepest feelings of friendship. We cannot recognize this regime, and we consider it inconceivable that it should be seated in the United Nations when its entire 5-year history has been a clear denial of the basic principles on which that organization is founded.

We are determined in our support of Free China because we believe not only that it more truly represents the wishes of the Chinese people than does the Peiping regime but also that it better serves the interests of the free world as a whole, as well as our own interests. The Government of the Republic of China has made great strides in many areas during its time on Formosa. We will not forsake the people of Free China. It would clearly be the height of injustice to allow the 10 million Chinese there to fall under Communist sway against their clearly demonstrated wishes. These people know communism. Many of them have relatives on the mainland who have suffered greatly due to the excesses of the mainland regime. Furthermore, if there were not a free Chinese government which is a going and growing concern, the Chinese Communists would have a much stronger hand among the 12 million overseas Chinese throughout Southeast Asia. The direct and indirect influence which could then be more effectively wielded by the Communists in the economic and political life of these countries would be dangerously enhanced.

In addition to Communist China the only territorial gains which communism has made in Asia are in North Korea and North Viet-Nam. These gains are tragic, most of all for the peoples directly affected. But there is much from which we can take encouragement. For one thing, no

group of people has yet voted itself into communism. The precedent of collective action against overt aggression gives us hope that this road may be forever closed to communism, and the growing awareness among Asians of the reality of Communist threats gives us hope that infiltration and subversion will be increasingly difficult. Our military support and technical cooperation programs in the Far East are proof of our desire to assist the independent governments of the area in their difficult tasks of meeting defense needs and at the same time building stable and progressive societies patterned on democratic principles.

I do not begin to believe that the Communists are pursuing with masterly skill an infallible blueprint of strategy in Asia or anywhere else. In Japan the Communists counted upon a long and unpopular occupation and upon economic distress to make the Japanese people turn to communism. This has not happened. Japan has now resumed an honorable place in the community of nations and despite some unsolved economic difficulties has made a most impressive recovery. The Communist aggression in Korea was not only thrown back; it established the two very important principles of collective action against aggression and of non-forceful repatriation. The Communists have met with a near total defeat in the Philippines, after a period which must have given them considerable cause for hope. Indonesia, according to the Communist timetable, was to have fallen some 4 years ago, but the Communist uprising at that time was put down with determined effectiveness. The Communists have gotten virtually nowhere in Thailand, Burma, or India. Communist-led rebels in Malaya are still a problem, but less so than was the case some months ago. There appears to be a real determination on the part of the free peoples of the Associated States to remain free, and the recent pact signed at Manila should help insure that this will be possible. Edmund Burke once said, "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." Asians are increasingly aware that there are things to be done if their freedom—in many cases recently won—is to be safeguarded. And in the last analysis, the only effective anticomunism in Asia must be Asian.

We should not be overly concerned by differences which may be debated among the free-world nations. In areas of free speech things are never so bad as they sound, just as in areas of controlled

speech things are never so good as they sound. There will be differences among free friends. But dependable friendship is needed in order to preserve freedom, and I believe that this is a deep conviction of the free world. We cannot go it alone and we have no desire to try it. We will all make some mistakes, for our governments are made up of human beings; but our aim is to achieve the highest possible degree of fraternal concert with our friends.

Asia is determined to find a new day. Whatever else may be in doubt in that changing continent, it is a certainty that a determined effort is going to be made by Asians to better their lot—through whatever auspices appear to them most attractive.

The whole world has high stakes in Asia, and we, the wealthiest and most powerful nation in the free world, have special and inescapable responsibilities for the outcome in Asia, although the solution in the last analysis must be essentially of, by, and for Asians.

Recently a great friend of the American people, and one of the great men of all time, Winston Churchill, had this to say of the United States: "There is no other case of a nation arriving at the summit of world power, seeking no territorial gain, but earnestly resolved to use her strength and wealth in the cause of progress and freedom." God grant that our nation will always measure up to this great compliment. As long as it does, provided we look also to defense through material strength, that spiritual drive which is the indispensable ingredient of the American spirit will afford us at least the surest security which can be had, in a future which must be dangerous and adventuresome at best. For this I believe, and I believe it more the longer I watch events in both hemispheres: a nation, like a man, can in the long run, and especially in things that really matter, reap only what has first been sown.

It is true that the real battle between communism and the free world is for the minds and hearts of men. It must be demonstrated beyond the power of iron curtains to hide that free systems of government and economy can inspire the hearts, tap the energies, and meet the needs of mankind incomparably better than can systems of state regimentation and control. This is the battle, which we welcome, for we can win that battle. But we and the free world must survive, in order to fight it. We cannot afford to allow ourselves to be lulled into a sense of false security by the

"peace offensive" soporific. Certainly at the same time we must continually seek safe avenues to a more peaceful world. As President Eisenhower recently put it, "Since the advent of nuclear weapons, it seems clear that there is no longer any alternative to peace, if there is to be a happy and well world." But we must keep our guard up. Our guard is up at present. I know of no spot in the free world which the Communists today can attack with impunity. We must keep it that way.

• *Mr. Jenkins, author of the above article, is Officer in Charge of Political Affairs, Office of Chinese Affairs. His article is based on recent address.*

## North Atlantic Council Meets at Paris

### NEWS CONFERENCE STATEMENT BY SECRETARY DULLES

Press release 726 dated December 24

I returned yesterday from the Paris meeting of the Nato Council. The communique which was issued reports in summary form what took place. I would like to comment briefly on two items in the communique.

The first was the statement that Soviet policy continues to be directed toward weakening and dividing the Western nations and that the threat to the free world has not diminished. It is significant that there was complete agreement on this proposition by all of the 14 nations represented on the Nato Council.

During the course of the discussion of this matter at the Council, I made a statement on behalf of the United States delegation in which I said that Soviet policy is like a powerful stream, the surface of which is sometimes ruffled, the surface of which is sometimes calm, but that we cannot judge the force and direction of the current merely by looking at the surface manifestations. The important thing, I said, is that we should proceed in our own way, steadily building our own strength and our own unity upon which our strength depends. There were, I said, three great dangers to be avoided:

(1) that we might by surface calm of the Soviet stream be lulled into a false sense of security;

(2) that by the rough appearance of the Soviet stream we might be frightened into a state of paralysis; or

(3) be provoked into ill-considered and divisive action.

In developing the first danger, I pointed out that behind the recent Soviet peace offensive was to be found ever increasing military strength far beyond defensive needs and the development of subversive activities in every free country, and notably attempts to exploit the theme of colonialism so as to divide and weaken the free world.

In connection with the second danger, I was frightened into a view of increased violent Soviet threats which had been directed against the West in connection with the Marshall Plan, the adoption of the North Atlantic Treaty, the adherence of Turkey to the North Atlantic Treaty, the development of the Federal German Republic in West Germany, and again Yugoslavia when it broke loose from the Soviet Council of Ministers. At that time, the Soviet Union dissolved the treaty of friendship which had been made in 1945 between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union.

I recalled that, at the time of the conclusion of the Japanese peace treaty, the Communists had suggested that, since the peace was not assured by the Soviet Union, it was a separate peace which violated the atmosphere and that the Soviet Union would be free to resume hostilities.

There is a striking parallel in the past to what is going on in the present. I expressed confidence that, if we persist in building defensive strength and unity in Western Europe, it will effectively promote peace.

To illustrate the third danger of being provoked into rash and divisive action, I referred to the provocation to which the United States is now being subjected by Communist China and the pressure being demonstrated by our country under the direction of President Eisenhower.

I took occasion to thank the Nato nations which were members of the United Nations for their support of the recent United Nations resolution condemning the Chinese Communists and calling for the liberation of our wrongfully imprisoned airmen.

The second item of the agenda to which I would allude is that which reports the approval of a report by the Military Committee which defined the

BRITAIN, 20 DECEMBER 1954

most effective pattern of Nato military defensive strength for the next few years, taking into account modern developments and weapons and techniques.

This report, which assumes a unity that includes Western Germany, shows for the first time the means of developing a forward strategy which could be relied on to protect Western Europe from invasion. As that capability is developed, it will surely constitute the strongest deterrent against military aggression. Furthermore, it will assure that, if unhappily aggression should be attempted, it would not succeed and that the aggressor would be thrown back at the threshold. Thus we see the means of achieving what the people of Western Europe have long sought—that is, a form of security which, while leaving intact the objective of prevention of peace, would also be adequate for deterrence and which would not put Western Europe in a position of having to be libberated.

The Chairman's action made it clear that, in preparing the report, it did not for the purposes of planning and preparation consider the did not involve delegations to the military in a field which is properly the responsibility of government with respect to putting plans into action in the event of hostilities. The situation is thus normalized in this respect. In the country, as in the other Nato countries, it is the civil authorities of government and not the military who make the grave decisions. That, of course, will be the situation as regards the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The Council meeting showed a spirit of fellowship and a spirit of optimism which grew out of the prospect that the Western European unity planned by the recent London and Paris accords would shortly become an accomplished fact and that both strengthen Nato and assure that it will effectively serve its purpose in deterring aggression and preserving peace.

#### TEXT OF COMMUNIQUE

*In full, is the text of a communiqué issued at Paris on December 18 by the North Atlantic Council at the close of a 3-day session.*

The North Atlantic Council, meeting in Paris in non ministerial session under the chairmanship of Mr. Stephanos Stephanopoulos, Foreign Minister of Greece, completed its work today. It